

Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by *Haller*. Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the first spring is in direct contact with the sleeve and the inner diameter surface. The male portion of *Haller* has a second outer contact 41 sleeve (identified by the Examiner as the “first spring”) formed in a “c” shape that presses axially against the forward end of a female portion helical spring “second contact 16”, compressing the spring axially to form a secure contact as the connector portions are mated together (col. 2 ln 42-52). The lower ends 50, 51 of the second outer contact 41 sleeve mate within axial slits 78 of the first body for radial support, preventing radial deformation of the second outer contact 41 to ensure it presses axially against the forward end of the second contact 16, even if the connector bodies are rotated with respect to each other (col. 4 ln 4-22).

As specifically cited from the *Haller* description, herein above, the *Haller* “first spring” only contacts the second contact 16, axially, not the inner diameter surface. The “first spring” is insulated from the inner diameter surface by passage through the axial slits 78 of the housing 36 (see *Haller*, figures 7 and 9). Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the first spring is in direct contact with the sleeve and inner diameter surface. Because the “first spring” identified by the Examiner in *Haller* does not directly contact the inner diameter surface, whatsoever, each and every element of the claimed invention fails to appear in the cited reference. Therefore, rejection of claims 12-13 under 35 USC 102(b) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by *Hall*. In *Hall*, the “first spring” 33 identified by the Examiner is an axial compression element, fully enclosed at the cable end of the connector, completely isolated from the male/female connection interface (see *Hall*, figure 3). Therefore, the “first spring” 33 is not in direct contact with either the sleeve 25 or the inner diameter surface. Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the first spring is in direct

contact with the sleeve and inner diameter surface. Because the "first spring" 33 identified by the Examiner in *Hall* does not directly contact the inner diameter surface, whatsoever, each and every element of the claimed invention fails to appear in the cited reference. Therefore, rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Guimond* in view of *Nelson*. The *Guimond* connector is an extremely complex cam action device with a plurality of separate components, each of which decreases the reliability and increases the required number of manufacturing steps and overall cost of the resulting connector. *Guimond* has a body 18 to which a plurality of fingers 30, cited as outer "spring fingers" by the Examiner, are movably attached by pins 62. The fingers 30 are biased in an open position (col. 3, line 35), by a mechanical cam interaction with an axially slid able coaxial line segment 14 biased into a forward axial position by a spring 50 that holds the fingers 30 in the open position by cam action. The outer "spring fingers" are not biased for an interference fit with the outer diameter surface, they only contact the outer diameter surface upon removal of the mechanical cam action via axial movement of the coaxial line segment 14 and sleeve 35 to overcome the open position bias of the pivoting spring fingers created by the spring 50.

Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the outer spring fingers according to the invention are integral with the body (see specification figures 5 and 11), not the separate elements movably attached to the body as appear in *Guimond*. No spring fingers of any kind appear in *Nelson*.

Because the *Guimond* outer "spring fingers" are neither biased for an interference fit with the outer diameter surface nor integral with the body as claimed by the present invention, each and every element of the invention fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-11 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Guimond* in view of *Nelson* and further in view of *Maury*. The Examiner states that *Guimond* in view of *Nelson* discloses the claimed invention except for the connector having an SMA or Type N connector interface and supplies *Maury* therefore. As described in detail herein above with respect to independent claim 1, as currently amended, from which claim 6 depends, *Guimond* and or *Nelson* both fail to demonstrate the claim elements of outer spring fingers biased for an interference fit with the outer diameter surface or the outer spring fingers integral with the body as claimed by the present invention. Further, the Examiner's description of *Maury* similarly fails to identify these elements. Therefore, rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

An antecedent basis error appearing in claims 13-17 as originally filed has been corrected.

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Haller* in view of *Maury*. The Examiner states that *Haller* discloses the claimed invention except for a second spring located in a second groove located around the plurality of outer spring fingers, the second spring biasing the spring fingers inward (claim 14) or that the connector has an SMA or Type N connector interface (claim 17), and supplies *Maury* therefore. The fact that *Haller* fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 12, as currently amended, from which claims 14 and 17 depend is addressed in detail herein above.

Further, the outer spring fingers the Examiner has identified in *Maury* are not biased inward, they are biased outward and the second spring identified by the Examiner is in fact itself an electrical contact, not a bias element as the outer diameter mounting position of the "second spring" around the "outer spring fingers" cited by the Examiner would inhibit rather than enhance the spring fingers outward bias (col. 2 ln 34-53). Because the Examiner has failed to identify each and

every element of the invention as disclosed, taught or suggested in the cited references, rejection of claims 14 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Haller*.

The Examiner states that *Haller* discloses the claimed invention except for a third groove for the first spring on the inner diameter surface of the bore. The fact that *Haller* fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 12, as currently amended, from which claims 15 and 16 depend is addressed in detail herein above. Therefore, rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Hall*. The Examiner states that *Hall* discloses the claimed invention except for a third groove for the first spring on the inner diameter surface of the bore. The fact that *Hall* fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 12, as currently amended, from which claims 15 and 16 depend is addressed in detail herein above. Therefore, rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC
24154 Lakeside Dr.
Lake Zurich, IL 60047
Telephone: 847 719-2063
Fax: 847 438-5743